

**Figure S-8 Railroad Underpass: Poorer Examples**



**McKinley**



**Central  
South of Vernor**



**Vinewood**

## Alternatives

Alternatives to be examined in the project include both rail yard/railroad strategies and highway improvements that respond to and influence each other. The highway alternatives will respond to the rail strategies. And, once a round of simulation of highway traffic is complete, a “feed back loop” will influence whether gates are changed in number and/or location. Likewise, the highway improvements will be blended to both handle the traffic and respond to community interests.

## Criteria

This phase of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project is designed to determine whether there are feasible, practical alternatives with which to proceed toward implementation. If so, an environmental document must be prepared and approved if federal funds are to be used. And, while the Feasibility Study phase does not include preparation of an Environmental Assessment, the work is to be supportive of and useful in that effort.

An environmental review designed to gain federal clearance/approval typically address almost two dozen criteria (Table S-1). Issues like effects on endangered plants and/or animals and construction considerations during project implementation are important subjects in gaining federal environmental clearance. But, because this is a feasibility study not an environmental study, the consultant has selected eight criteria, listed alphabetically, which will be meaningful in the evaluation of the conceptual/illustrative alternatives.

- n Air Quality
- n Community Cohesion
- n Displacements
- n Engineering Difficulty
- n Environmental Justice
- n Historic Properties
- n Noise
- n Traffic Flow

Table S-1  
Environmental Analysis Categories

1. Air Quality
2. Coastal Zone
3. Community Cohesion and Community Services
4. Construction Impacts
5. Cultural Resources
6. Development (including secondary development)
7. Energy
8. Environmental Justice
9. Floodplains
10. Geology, Soils, Utilities and Other Engineering Considerations
11. Land Acquisition and Displacements
12. Land Use and Zoning – Consistency with Planning
13. Maintenance of Traffic
14. Noise
15. Prime and Unique Farmlands
16. Socioeconomic Impacts
17. Traffic and Transportation
  - Traffic Volumes
  - + Level of Service
  - + Accidents/Safety
  - + Pedestrians/Bicyclists
18. Water<sup>†</sup> Quality
19. Wetlands
20. Wild and Scenic Rivers
21. Wildlife and Threatened and Endangered Species

Source: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 6640.8A and The Corradino Group

## Participants

Each of these factors will be used to evaluate the Illustrative Alternatives so those with the least potential of acceptance will be eliminated. The remaining options will then be subject to a second, more rigorous, analysis with additional public input. The public will be invited to score these measures on a scale of 1 to 100 (Figure S-9) to establish their importance. The project's Local Advisory Council, Technical Team, and consultant will do likewise. These sets of weighted values will then be used by the consultant to evaluate the alternatives.

Figure S-9

**Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project  
Scoring Form – Evaluation Criteria**

*How Important Are These Items?*

We want to know how you value the eight evaluation criteria/factors listed below. To provide us your opinion, please rate them on the scale of "1" through "100", with the highest rating indicating the item you believe is most important. Draw a line from the dot ( • ) following each factor on the left, to the scale on the right, to indicate your opinion. When finished, return your form to a project representative, or by email, or by fax at the addresses listed at the bottom of this form.

Your opinions will be used to evaluate the Illustrative Alternatives of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project. Thank you.

Factor		Rating Scale
Air Quality	•	100
Community Cohesion	•	
Displacements	•	
Engineering Difficulty	•	
Environmental Justice	•	50
Historic Properties	•	
Noise	•	
Traffic Flow	•	0

**EXAMPLE**

Factor: Air Quality, Rating Scale: 100

Factor: Community Cohesion, Rating Scale: 75

Factor: Displacements, Rating Scale: 50

Factor: Engineering Difficulty, Rating Scale: 25

Factor: Environmental Justice, Rating Scale: 10

Factor: Historic Properties, Rating Scale: 5

Factor: Noise, Rating Scale: 0

Factor: Traffic Flow, Rating Scale: 0

[www.mdot.mi.us/projects/DIFT](http://www.mdot.mi.us/projects/DIFT)  
 Hotline: 313.964.4543  
 Fax: 313.964.1984

The evaluation process will involve collecting data for each criterion for each Illustrative Alternative. The consultant will then examine the proposed project as it performs in each category, then apply the different weights by group (i.e., public, Local Advisory Council, Technical Team and Consultant) to determine which concepts perform better than others. Poorer options will be eliminated.

## Next Steps

The set of Illustrative Alternatives will be finalized based on public input received at the May round of public meetings. The meetings are scheduled as follows:

### DIFT Public Meetings

Date:	May 23, 2001	May 24, 2001
Time:	6:30 p.m.	6:30 p.m.
Location:	LA SED Youth Center 7150 W. Vernor	B.U.O.Y. Center 3041 Vernor

The evaluation will involve criteria weighting beginning at the May round of public meetings. An additional period until June 15 will be provided to allow broad citizen input. The consultant will produce the results of the evaluation for public comment in late July. Based on this input, the next set of alternatives will be established. Citizen input to the values of a possibly revised criteria set to be used in the second-level evaluation will begin at the July round of public meetings. The second-level evaluation will be presented to the public in October.